

Remarks

Claims 10-12, 17-26, 30-35, and 38-59 are pending. Claims 10-12, 17-26, 30-35, and 38-59 are rejected.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Examiner and Applicants' Attorney discussed this rejection telephonically on April 16, 2007. Per Examiner, claim 54 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 10, 17-26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 42, 43, 45-47, 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dixon (US Pat. No. 6,289,461). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dixon in view of Ottensooser (US Pat. No. 5,905,856). Claims 32, 33, 38-41, 48-50, 52, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dixon in view of Bobo (US Pat. No. 5,870,549). Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dixon in view of Schneier (Applied Cryptography).

With regard to claims 17, 22, 24, 30, 42, and 55, Examiner attempts to find all the claimed limitations in the following passages of Dixon:

FIG. 4 illustrates one embodiment of an HTTP request in more detail. An HTTP request includes header information which identifies it as an HTTP request, specifies the destination of the request, and specifies various additional characteristics. The header can be followed by data in any format. In the illustrated embodiment, the data includes a prefix indicating which messages, if any, client system 110 received in the last response from server system 120. Here, the prefix indicates that client system 110 received messages 1 through N in the last response. After the prefix, the request also includes copies of all the messages 1 through M stored in buffer 220. When the request is received by server system 120, server system 120 will provide messages 1 through M to server process 310. Server system 120 will also remove messages 1 through N from the messages

stored in buffer 320 and send only the remaining messages, if any, in the next response.

FIG. 5 illustrates one embodiment of an HTTP response. Like the request, the response includes header information which identifies it as an HTTP response corresponding to a particular HTTP request, specifies the destination, and specifies various additional characteristics of the response. The header can be followed by data in any format. In the illustrated embodiment, the data includes a prefix indicating which messages, if any, server system 120 received in the last request. Here, the prefix indicates that server system 120 received messages 1 through M in the last request. After the prefix, the response also includes copies of the messages 1 through N stored in buffer 320. When the response is received by client system 110, client system 110 will provide messages 1 through N to client process 210, remove messages 1 through M from the messages stored in buffer 220, and send only the remaining messages, if any, in the next request.

Neither system removes a message from its buffer before receiving an indication that the message was received. Also, as discussed above, client system 110 will send a request if a response is not received within a certain amount of time. For example, if a request never reaches server system 120 for whatever reason, client system 110 will send another request including the same messages and any additional messages that may have accumulated. Similarly, if a response never arrives, client system 110 will send another request and server system 120 will send another response including the same messages and any additional messages that may have accumulated. Furthermore, if a request or a response is received, but the messages are unreadable, the corresponding returned prefix will indicate that the messages were unreadable and the messages will be resent. In this manner, the present invention provides reliable message transmission over inherently unreliable communications media.

Col. 6, l. 43 - col. 7, l. 27.

The above merely discusses the format of HTTP requests/responses and indicates that client system 110 and server system 120 issue these requests/responses respectively. The above also discusses the mechanism by which Dixon provides reliable message transmission. The above,

and Dixon generally, however, fail to teach all the elements of claims 17, 22, 24, 30, 42, and 55.

With regard to claim 17, Dixon fails to teach supplying the formatted access request to a first intermediary/data broker. As explained above, client system 110 and server system 120 communicate via HTTP requests/responses. Neither is an intermediary.

With regard to claim 17, Dixon fails to teach validating the formatted access request in accordance with the request message specification. Dixon merely states that

the present invention utilizes loop-hole 150 to create a TCP/IP like connection between client system 110 and server system 120 by sending messages out as HTTP formatted requests and receiving messages back as HTTP formatted responses. In this manner, the present invention maintains the level of security provided by firewall 140 while providing a TCP/IP-type connection.

Col. 3, ll. 57-64.

Sending out messages as HTTP requests is not validating formatted access requests in accordance with a request message specification.

With regard to claim 17, Dixon fails to teach forwarding the validated access request across the security barrier. As explained above, Dixon lacks a validated access request.

With regard to claims 22, 24, 30, 42, and 55, Examiner rejected these claims on effectively the same basis as claim 17. Although these claims differ in scope, for the reasons claim 17 is patentable, claims 22, 24, 30, 42, and 55 are patentable.

The dependent claims are patentable because they depend from one of the independent claims.

Applicants' Attorney submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests a notice to that effect. Applicants' Attorney also invites a telephone conference if Examiner believes that it will advance the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVID L. WOOD ET AL.

By /Benjamin C. Stasa/
Benjamin C. Stasa
Reg. No. 55,644
Attorney for Applicants

Date: May 3, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351